

8. (Original) The method of claim 5 where the oxygen tensions employed are in increments of 5 or 10 mm Hg.

9. (Original) The method of Claim 6 where the set of proteins is associated with a physiological process and the method is used to identify normal protein functions.

10. (Original) The method of Claim 6 where the set of proteins is associated with a pathophysiological process and the method is used to identify protein functions associated with the pathophysiological process.

REMARKS

No new matter is added.

Restriction Requirement

Briefly, the Office Action contained a Restriction Requirement that classified the claims into four groups:

Group I: Claims 1-4, drawn to a method for establishing a genomic interaction map to compare physiological and pathophysiological processes, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

Group II: Claims 1-10, drawn to a method for establishing a proteomic interaction map to compare physiological and pathophysiological processes, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1

Group III: Claim 11, drawn to a method for identifying a previously unknown (orphan) receptor or activating ligand, classified in class 435, subclass 7.8.


Group IV: Claim 12, drawn to a method for identifying epitopes to serve as markers for a disease by immunostaining tissue exposed to redox conditions, classified in class 435, subclass 40.52.

In response to the March 19, 2003 Restriction Requirement, Applicants elect **Group II**,

claims 1-10, for further prosecution with traverse. The Restriction Requirement is traversed because it would not be an undue burden for the USPTO to examine all of the claims. The groups are classified into the same class and subclass, and Group I and Group II share common claims -- claims 1-4. Further, since both Group I and Group II methods may be used to compare physiological and pathophysiological processes, the inclusion of a method for establishing both a genomic interaction map and a proteomic interaction map would not be an undue burden. For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

This response is due on May 19, 2003 with a one-month extension. A check in the amount of \$55.00 in payment of the fee required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(1), is enclosed herewith. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or to credit any overpayment, to the undersigned's account, Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No.24862-503 (Customer Number: 35437).

Respectfully submitted,


Ivor R. Elrifi, Reg. No. 39,529
Melissa Handler, Reg. No. 52,988
Attorneys for Applicants
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS
GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C.
666 Third Avenue, 24th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 935-3000
Telefax: (212) 983-3115

Date: May 19, 2003



35437

PATENT/TRADEMARK OFFICE

NYC 261003v2